



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to be found a few verses farther on, where he says that "through one man's disobedience the many were made (or constituted) sinners." They did not actually sin, when Adam sinned, but when he fell, God, by a sovereign dispensation, constituted them sinners; that is, proceeded to regard and treat them as such. But how can God regard, condemn, and punish as sinners those who have not actually, that is, really, sinned at all? Answer: He made a covenant with Adam that he should stand forth as the representative of the race. Mankind should stand or fall with him. If he succumbed to temptation, then all his descendants were to be dealt with *as if* they had committed his sin; that is, were to become the objects of God's wrath and to be exposed to the doom of eternal death. If one asks: How is this fair or just? How can men be condemned for the sin of a representative in whose choice they had no part? Answer: Who art thou that repliest against God?

Such are the historic, orthodox theories of original sin. Each contradicts the other, and both claim to be Pauline. Now, the author of the books under review is of opinion that Paul knew nothing of Augustinian realism, much less of that series of covenants (mostly made in Holland) by which one school of seventeenth-century Calvinists resolved sundry theological problems. I have mentioned these theories merely to point the contrast between the *a priori* and the historic method of approaching and treating theological problems. The latter proceeds on the supposition that, if Paul is explicable at all, he is explicable as a part of his own world and time.

GEORGE B. STEVENS.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn.

THE APOCRYPHAL ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.¹

DURING the last twenty years considerable progress has been made toward a right understanding of the vexed questions relating to the apocryphal books of Acts. The pioneer work was begun long ago by Grabe and Fabricius, but they had not the necessary tools with which to work out their problems. Thilo, whose "marvelous learning" rightly evoked expressions of admiration from Lipsius, published critical editions of the *Acts of Thomas* (1823), *Peter and Paul* (1837 f.), *Andrew and Matthew* (1846), and fragments of the *Acts of John* (1847). His careful labor did much to render possible Tischendorf's great work, the *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (1851),

¹ *Die alten Petrusakten im Zusammenhang der apokryphen Apostellitteratur nebst einem neuentdeckten Fragment.* Untersucht von Carl SCHMIDT. [Texte und Untersuchungen," Neue Folge, IX, 1.] Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903. viii+176 pages. M. 6.

which long remained the standard edition. In the seventies several English scholars contributed new material; *e. g.*, Wright's publications from the Syriac, including the first complete text of the *Acts of Thomas* (1871); Malan's translation of the *Certamen Apostolorum*, made from an Ethiopic version (1871); and Phillips's *Doctrina Addaei*, in Syriac and English (1876). In 1880 Zahn published his *Acta Johannis*, furnished with valuable notes on this and other apocrypha, the whole forming an important contribution to the subject. Three years later Lipsius began to publish his studies entitled *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden* (1883-90), following these up with the best critical edition of the texts, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*—the new Tischendorf—which was completed by Bonnet (1891-1903).

Meanwhile several other specialists have been investigating the subject, and new discoveries have been made. In England M. R. James, and in Germany Harnack, have thrown light upon the *Acts of Paul* and of *John*. Corssen, Erbes, and most recently Ficker have advanced various ingenious theories, which at least must stimulate further research. And now Carl Schmidt, of Berlin, has published a valuable Coptic fragment of the *Acts of Peter*, accompanying it with learned discussions of the apocryphal literature as a whole. If he has not definitively solved all the problems, he has certainly done much to aid in their solution, and his forthcoming edition of the *Acts of Paul* and of the *Gnostic* writings (from the Coptic) will be eagerly awaited.

It was formerly supposed that the apocryphal *Acts* were forged by heretics, and this view still has many adherents. In its support ancient authorities are cited, from Eusebius down to Photius. Of late, however, this theory has more and more been called in question. Zahn and others have made it clear that the *Acts of Paul* were Catholic from the outset. Eusebius ranks them higher than the rest, and Augustine appeals to them almost as confidently as to the New Testament. These *Acts* embraced the well-known *Acts of Paul* and *Thecla*, the apocryphal correspondence between Paul and the *Corinthians*, and other material. The whole work was current in the fifth century and appears to have enjoyed canonical authority in some sections of the church. Harnack's arguments in favor of a Catholic origin of the *Acts of Peter* are cogent enough to have won apparent assent from a naturally conservative critic like the Roman Catholic Ehrhard. Another scholar of the same church, Bardenhewer, recognizes considerable sections of the apocryphal acts as orthodox. Schmidt finally comes forward with the sweeping assertion that there were originally no heretical *Acts* at all. This theory, if true, completes the historical rehabilitation of

these books. But it is not destined to pass unchallenged, for, in spite of Schmidt's confidence, there is grave doubt whether his theory can be accepted without important modification.

Schmidt holds that the apocryphal Acts originated in orthodox circles, and circulated at first separately, being widely read by all sorts of Christians; that they were collected into a *corpus* by the Manichæans, in the fourth century, when disputes arose over their canonicity; and that the high authority they enjoyed among Manichæans and Priscillianists led to their rejection by the Catholic church. The trouble was that the books had fallen into bad company. But they were too popular to be spared. The church, therefore, while protecting the purity of her doctrine, found it necessary at the same time to satisfy the public demand for religious romances by revising these books, eliminating whatever was adjudged dangerous, and putting them forth again, in expurgated form, with her official sanction. Thus arose the *virtutes* and *passiones apostolorum*, such as are found, for instance, in the Abdias collection. But before the fifth century, in Schmidt's view, the apocryphal Acts suffered no worse textual corruption than did other books, against whose orthodoxy no objection could be urged. He rightly insists that we should guard against allowing ourselves to be misled by the unfavorable opinion of ecclesiastical writers from Eusebius and Epiphanius onward, all of whom failed to understand the conditions of an earlier age, and, when they found ideas which were either obsolete or positively rejected among themselves, supposed the writings which contained them must of course have originated among heretics. Schmidt himself does not find anything in the Acts of Peter which need have caused anxiety to the orthodox mind of the third century. He regards the books in question as a valuable source for the study of contemporary popular Catholicism, and incidentally as an illustration of the interesting process by which fiction came to be viewed as history. They also indicate the kind of missionary preaching then in vogue.

The only objection to his hypothesis, which Schmidt anticipates, arises in connection with the Acts of Thomas, which contain the well-known Gnostic hymns. He attempts to destroy the force of this objection by reminding his readers that the Acts of Thomas originated in Syria, where the influence of Tatian and Bardesanes was so strong that not even Catholics could escape it. That is to say, Syrian Catholicism in the third century was substantially Gnostic—which many persons will think doubtful. Von Dobschütz has brought forward other objections to Schmidt's thesis in the *Theologische Litteratur-Zeitung* (1903, No. 12), showing that he himself is not convinced.

One point, not satisfactorily treated in the book before us, is the evidence of Philaster of Brescia. It is quite true that testimony drawn from writers

of the fourth and fifth centuries must be used with caution; but, on the other hand, it cannot be neglected. And the first step toward using it rightly is to understand what it means. Schmidt justly complains that Lipsius misinterpreted the passage from Philaster,² but he himself has committed the same fault. The passage runs as follows:³

Scripturae autem absconditae, id est apocrypha, etsi legi debent morum causa a perfectis, non ab omnibus legi debent, quia non intelligentes multa addiderunt et tulerunt quae voluerunt haeretici.

Lipsius understands Philaster to mean that various redactions of these Acts, some of them falsified by heretics in the interest of their views, were then current, wherefore all such books should be read with caution, and by some not at all. But there is nothing in the text to justify the assertion that Catholic and heretical recensions of these Acts were then in circulation together. Schmidt expounds Philaster's meaning thus:

Er begründet seinen Standpunkt damit, dass *non intelligentes* vieles hinzugefügt und hinweggethan haben, was die Häretiker (als ihre Lehre) gewollt haben. Er unterscheidet also scharf zwischen *non intelligentes* und *haeretici*. Diese *non intelligentes* sind aber katholische Christen, die in ihrem Unverstande den ursprünglichen Text verdorben und auf diese Weise den Lehren der Häretiker Vorschub geleistet haben.⁴

But instead of "sharply distinguishing between *non intelligentes* and *haeretici*," Philaster certainly refers to the same persons in both phrases. He complains that the heretics, in their blameworthy ignorance of the truth, have taken liberties with the text of the apocryphal Acts. This form of expression is frequent in Philaster's work; *e. g.*, in cap. 60 he speaks of heretics thus: "non intelligunt virtutem scripturae;" and in cap. 89: "et quia addiderunt in ea [*i. e.*, the epistle to the Laodicæans] quaedam non bene sentientes, inde non legitur in ecclesia" Ignorance and evil thinking are with this writer the attributes of heretics, not of Catholics. Zahn has rightly understood the passage, "die Ketzer in ihrem Unverstand haben sie [*i. e.*, the Acts] vielfach interpolirt."⁵ So far, then, as Philaster's evidence goes, we must conclude simply that he believed heretics had taken great liberties with the text, but this does not necessarily militate against the theory of Catholic origin for these apocrypha.

Lipsius was no doubt mistaken in the verdict he passed upon some of the writings which he edited; yet concerning others we can perhaps do no better today than to repeat his carefully guarded opinion: they originated in heretical, "oder doch später häretisch gewordenen Kreisen." This,

² *De Haeresibus*, cap. 88. ³ Ed. OEHLER (Berlin, 1856). ⁴ *Petrusakten*, pp. 131 f.

⁵ *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Vol. II, p. 843, note.

however, is not to deny the genuine value of Schmidt's work, for the early history of these Acts is undoubtedly much more accurately understood than before, by reason of his careful and learned investigations.

J. W. PLATNER.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

JESUS AND THE GOSPELS.

FOR many years now it has been true that every representative sheaf of new writings on the origin of Christianity has presented a great variety of conflicting views. This fact, whether we regard it complacently as a sign of life, or see in it an evidence of the inexplicable character of the problems, is still daily illustrated. The books now to be noticed are no exception. On the one hand, we are told that no inconsiderable part even of Mark's gospel is to be credited to the redactor, that Luke invented some of his "facts," that the author of our Matthew adapted the ancient gospel material to catechetical and liturgical use, and that the fourth gospel does not claim to be historical, but is a defense of orthodox Gnosticism; and, on the other hand, we read a work, approved by high ecclesiastical authority, which demonstrates that the four gospels were written by the men whose names they bear, that they contain no additions of a later age, not even the conclusion of Mark's gospel or the Johannean story of the woman taken in adultery—a work that allows the present necessity of a critical study of the gospels chiefly in order to answer the difficulties of "Protestants and rationalists," and that closes with the genealogy of the Virgin.

Yet if the critical field, like Dante's world, appears at times to be a wilderness, or even, like a section of his "Purgatory," a "forest of thick-crowded ghosts," nevertheless it will still be cultivated, and will doubtless produce ever richer harvests.

It is an interesting fact that two veteran Old Testament scholars—Wellhausen and Briggs—have almost simultaneously published the results of critical investigation of the gospels. The work of Wellhausen¹ which we are to consider is a compact and suggestive commentary on Mark. It gives also a translation of the text, which is a practical part of the book for the German reader, as it marks an advance on the revised Luther Bible. It takes no account of other interpretations of the gospel, ancient or modern. The reader gets without delay or confusion the results of the author's study. As regards the Greek text, especial attention is given to the readings of the Sinaitic Syriac and D. To the latter source Wellhausen gives more weight

¹ *Das Evangelium Marci. Uebersetzt und erklärt von J. WELLHAUSEN.* Berlin: Reimer, 1903. 146 pages.